



Bologna Process Implementation Report 2024:

State of play...

BFUG meeting, 19 February 2024

Tone Flood Strøm and David Crosier ,

Co Chairs, monitoring WG

State of play

Discussions on draft report began in BFUG Madrid

Ongoing dialogue with countries that sent comments

Final checking foreseen 11 March (2 weeks, no extension possible)

Main issues raised by BFUG

- 1) 2 scorecard indicators in the Key Commitments chapter (on degree structures and on quality assurance)
- 2) Social Dimension chapter: indicators to be reconsidered, as misrepresents reality (for countries with mainstreaming approach to inclusion)

Degree structures scorecard indicator proposal

<10% of students are enrolled in integrated/long programmes

Objections: 1) no EHEA agreement on % of students in long programmes (TRUE)

2) Contradiction with policy encouraging more medical education places (DEBATABLE)

Proposed solution for this report: <20% of students are enrolled in integrated/long programmes

-> The WG proposes discussing whether the EHEA decisions on degree structures are sufficient to ensure the continued implementation of the three cycle structure

Quality Assurance: stage of development of external QA system

Proposal from WG Monitoring to remove the light green category: (A Quality Assurance system is in operation nationwide and is aligned to the ESG, but the agency/ies performing external Quality Assurance is/are not registered in EQAR.)

Rationale: agreed method for demonstrating compliance with the ESG is EQAR registration

Objection: compliance with ESG can also be shown through ENQA membership

Argument against objection: Different ways of proving ESG compliance creates confusion (several ENQA member agencies have not been accepted as ESG compliant by EQAR register committee)

Proposed solution: maintain WG proposal, but provide reference in text to countries/agencies that are ENQA members but not registered on EQAR

Social dimension chapter

First draft approach: scorecard indicators for each of the 10 P&Gs, using the adopted text

Objection: misrepresents the situation in countries where mainstreamed general strategies on social inclusion are the norm.

Proposed solution: replace two scorecard indicators (on strategic commitment to social dimension, and community engagement) by more comprehensive mapping

Maintain 8 other scorecard indicators in line with agreement that policy commitments should be measured by scorecard indicators

Future Monitoring Options

- Paper submitted by WG Monitoring for BFUG
- Aim is to establish a coherent, longer-term vision and identity
- Current approach of monitoring an expanding policy agenda poses problems to BFUG members and data analysts/authors

What can be done?

- Paper outlines 3 options:
 - 1) Thematic monitoring
 - 2) Comprehensive monitoring
 - 3) Alternating thematic and comprehensive monitoring

Questions for discussion

- 1) Would any or all of the three options make sense for future monitoring?
- 2) For the 2027 report, would you prefer a thematic monitoring or comprehensive monitoring?
- 3) In a longer-term vision, would you prefer alternating between thematic and comprehensive reports, or a single type of monitoring?
- 4) Apart from the options presented, would you see any other option for future monitoring?

Next steps

- No need for immediate decision...
- WG Monitoring suggests asking questions via survey
- Decide outcome in Budapest
- All in favour, hands up

